

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13, 15-18, 20-22, 25, 26 and 28 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 are sought to be amended. Claims 29 and 30 are sought to be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2, 5, 6, 14, 19, 23, 24 and 27 remain canceled. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Based on the above Amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,207 (hereinafter referred to as "Petersen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,964,834 (hereinafter referred to as "Crutcher"). Claims 3, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Petersen in view of Crutcher and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,433 (hereinafter referred to as "D'Arlach"). Claims 16-18, 20-22, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Petersen in view of Crutcher and further in view of D'Arlach. Applicant assumes that dependent claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Petersen in view of Rankin and U.S. Patent No.

6,172,542 (hereinafter referred to as “Williams”) (used as evidence for Official Notice).

Applicant assumes that claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Petersen in view of Rankin and U.S. Patent No. 5,345,327 (hereinafter referred to as “Savicki”) (used as evidence for Official Notice). Claim 29 has been canceled rendering the rejection to this claim moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to pending claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13, 15-18, 20-22, 25, 26 and 28 because Petersen, Crutcher, Rankin, Williams, Savicki and D’Arlach, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 for at least the reason discussed below.

Objection to claim 30

Claim 30 is objected to for depending upon a rejected claim. Claim 30 has been canceled and its subject matter (along with the subject matter of claim 29) has been incorporated into independent claims 1, 12, 18 and 26. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 (and their dependent claims 3, 4, 7-11, 13, 15, 17, 20-22, 25 and 28) are patentable over Petersen, Crutcher, Rankin, Williams, Savicki and D’Arlach, taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.



Appln. Serial No. 09/823,215
Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed on March 9, 2006

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Intel Corporation

Dated: 3/22/2006

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126
Molly A. McCall
(703) 633-3311

P10854 RCE Reply to non-final OA-2

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: 3/22/2006

Signature: Julie Dussault 3/22/2006
Julie Dussault Date